International Journal of
Education Policy & Leadership

IJEPL
Volume 16(1)
2020

To Leave or to Stay: Faculty Mobility in the Middle East

Daniel S. Alemu, *The Sage Colleges*
Olga Pykhtina, *Heriot-Watt University, Dubai*

Abstract

Existing research on faculty mobility generally investigates the issue in the context of Western postsecondary institutions. This study adds to the body of knowledge through studying higher education faculty in six Middle Eastern countries. Participants of the study were higher education faculty members in Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. Out of 600 faculty members initially invited, 139 completed the electronic survey, which was administered in the 2017–2018 academic year. The findings show that factors both internal and external to an institution contributed to a faculty member's decision to stay or leave. It also shows that gender and experience in the GCC Universities had no significant effect on faculty members' intentions to leave or to stay.

Keywords Faculty mobility; Turnover; Intention to leave; GCC countries; Middle East faculty; Higher education; Faculty

Background and overview

Faculty mobility in higher education institutions has been widely researched (Barnes, Agago, & Coombs, 1998; Lawrence, Celis, & Ott, 2014; Rosser & Townsend, 2006;

Daniel S. Alemu & Olga Pykhtina. (2019). To Leave or Stay: Faculty Mobility in the Middle East. *International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership 16*(1). URL: http://journals.sfu.ca/ijepl/index.php/ijepl/article/view/895 doi: 10.22230/ijepl.2020v16n1a895

Smart, 1990; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996). The body of research on the topic paints a picture that faculty departure is to some extent a blessing to organizations and to a greater extent a curse. Despite faculty turnover having some positive effect on an institution, such as bringing in new ideas (Ambrose, Huston, & Norman, 2005), high turnover rates cause financial losses, the disruption of teaching and research, and discontinuity in student mentoring (Ehrenberg, Kasper, & Rees, 1990; Rosser, 2004; Xu, 2008). High turnover tarnishes the image and reputation of an institution and negatively affects the morale of the remaining faculty (Mobley, 1982; Price, 1997).

Studies focused on both multiple universities (Daly & Dee, 2006; Matier, 1990) and single institutions (Gardner, 2012) explored the factors that predict faculty mobility. The research expanded from exploring individual factors and personal decisions to organizational variables, including context and work-related issues (Cotton & Tuttle, 1986; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994). As some research concludes (Xu, 2008), a mixture of personal and institutional factors prompts faculty members into thinking of leaving. In addition, a number of studies explored the roles gender (Barnes et al. 1998) and discipline variations (Biglan, 1973; Clark, 1989; Xu, 2008) play in influencing faculty mobility. Factors such as tenure (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004), university policies toward outside offers (O'Meara, 2015), and psychological contracts (O'Meara, Bennett, & Neihaus, 2016) are also often identified as playing a major role in a faculty member's decision to depart.

John Smart (1990) attempted to summarize the factors influencing faculty mobility by grounding them in turnover theories that originated in the fields of economics, psychology, and sociology. He outlined three groups: 1) individual characteristics (e.g., gender and marital status); 2) work factors (e.g., research and teaching time); and 3) context (e.g., salary and organizational decline). While this framework serves as a good frame of reference, there may be many more factors influencing the decision-making process. These factors form complex interconnected nets that may be rooted in the culture itself (Rosser, 2004; Yan, Yue, & Niu, 2015). Researching institutions with predominantly multicultural faculty may be even more complex, as cross-cultural factors must be taken into account. For example, according to the United Arab Emirates' (UAE) Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research of the United Arab Emirates (as cited in Quansah, 2017), in such regions as the UAE the faculty populations at institutions licensed by UAE's Commission for Academic Accreditation (CAA) are highly diverse, with only 6.32 percent Emirati academic staff (Quansah, 2017). Therefore, it is not only the culture of the institution and the region that may affect faculty decision-making but also cross-cultural expectations.

While much research has been conducted in the area of faculty retention, little has been done to understand the reasons behind faculty mobility in the Middle East, where expatriates hold many teaching positions (Quansah, 2017). This study aims to investigate the relationship between faculty members' intention to depart, the proportion of time they spent in various academic activities, and their perception about their work and working conditions. The study also examines if there is any variation among faculty members' intentions to depart when factoring their gender, current place of work, experience in higher education teaching in the GCC, and the age of their children (if they have any).

Conceptual framework

Previous research on this topic explored various variables related to faculty mobility. Through *Causal Model of Faculty Turnover Intentions*, Smart (1990) studied turnover intentions using what he called *exogenous* (external to the institution) and *endogenous* (internal work environment) variables. The *push-pull model* used by Michael Matier (1990) suggests faculty turnover decisions are the outcome of internal (push) and external environmental (pull) factors. Researchers such as John Holland (1985); Deborah Olsen, Sue Maple, and Frances Stage (1995); and Jennifer Lindholm (2003) utilized the fit-misfit model of departure, contending that a faculty member's intention to leave is the result of a poor fit between the attributes of the work environment and personal values.

The conceptual framework for this study is based on several frequently used variables from the aforementioned turnover models, as well as the literature in the context of higher education. It is grouped into four categories: internal work environment, such as research, teaching, administration, and service; personal factors, such as family and work-life balance; compensation and benefits; and external environment factors.

Internal work environment

Research environment, teaching and administrative load, and organizational culture are among the most common and complicated dimensions affecting faculty turnover (Kingston-Mann & Sieber, 2001; O'Meara, 2015). As Yonghong Xu (2008) points out, it is not easy to quantify these tasks, especially when it comes to administrative workload and community service. Previous studies (Blackburn & Havighurst, 1979; Smart, 1990) indicate relationships between strong Faculty research interest and low turnover rates. KerryAnn O'Meara (2015) showed, however, that it is administrative and financial support from an institution that affect faculty mobility. In other words, if faculty members are not supported in carrying out their research, they are more likely to search for another university.

Research also suggests that the more teaching responsibilities faculty members have, the less likely they are to quit (see McGee & Ford, 1987). Nevertheless, such findings may be controversial. Teaching overload, which is a workplace stressor, has been shown to have detrimental effects on faculty job satisfaction that may lead to a faculty member leaving the institution (Rosser, 2004). In addition, in intercultural institutions where academics come from abroad, unfamiliar teaching pedagogy and language barriers may hinder job satisfaction and teaching quality (Chapman & Austin, 2002; Clarke, 2007; Hofstede, 1986). Expatriate academics may experience challenges in facing local students in class for the first time and adjusting to a new academic environment (Miller, 2009; Richardson & McKenna, 2002).

Faculty members have been shown to be more likely to leave due to dissatisfaction with aspects of the work environment that do not meet their expectations (Benzoni, Rousseau, & Li, 2006; Darrah, Hougland, & Prince, 2014). This is especially true for those who have just started their career in academia and formed their ideas through undergraduate and graduate studies (Lawrence et al., 2014; Trower, 2012). Expectations on behalf of both administration and faculty are related to com-

munication, openness, fair rewards, autonomy, and a voice in organizational decision-making (Austin, 2002; Lawrence et al., 2014; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996).

In addition to work expectations, psychological contracts as a part of the internal work environment were found to play a big role in faculty mobility. Psychological contracts, "the perceived mutual obligations that characterize the employee's relationship with his/her employer" (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994, p. 246), are unspoken and unwritten promises that faculty and institutions mutually expect to be fulfilled. Faculty members were found to be more likely to depart if such contracts were broken rather than just unmet (O'Meara, Bennett, & Neihaus, 2016; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Broken contracts were shown to influence faculty members' commitment to their institution, and were found to be a stronger predictor of faculty members' departure than of their overall satisfaction with their circumstances (Daly & Dee, 2006).

Personal factors

Researchers have also explored the connection between family related factors, work-life balance, and career path as the cause for faculty members' intention to quit (Aycan, 1997; Harvey, 1985). Family ties, responsibilities, friendships, and community relations have been suggested to directly affect faculty mobility (Flowers & Hughes, 1973). Marital status and family support may help expatriate academics adjust to a new environment and better cope with stress, decreasing the likelihood that the academic will return home to more familiar surroundings (Quansah, 2017).

Despite the fact that some faculty members leave without another job offer, outside offers and counter-offers are one of the crucial causes affecting the decision to depart (O'Meara, 2015). William Mobley (1982) suggested that intention to leave is correlated with pursuing individual career goals or a desire to move away from a stressful situation. Ying Zhou and James Fredericks Volkwein (2015) added that some individuals are not only following their career objectives but may be moving away to support their spouse's career or children's education.

Compensation and benefits

Some research has shown a reward system, including pay, promotion, and professional development funds to be crucial predictors of faculty departure (Daly & Dee, 2006; Johnsrud & Rosser, 2002; Rosser, 2004). There is some evidence, however, that an outside offer with a higher salary may not be the main factor influencing a faculty member's decision to leave—rather, it is an internal "push" element that prompts someone to seek and follow a "pull" from the outside, such as a better financial package (Matier, 1990). For example, if faculty were not satisfied with their job, a high salary would not be sufficient motivation to stay.

The idea of a reward system being a crucial factor in faculty retention has met opposition (Ambrose et al., 2005; Barnes et al., 1998). There are two main arguments often associated with the issue. The first is the difference in value placed on salary as a factor of retention by academic rank. Although the influence of salary among tenure and non-tenured faculty was not shown to be high in previous research (Brown, 1967), more recent studies have indicated that those in assistant and associate professor roles place more importance on monetary compensation (Ehrenberg

et al, 1990; Smart, 1990). The second argument relates to the perception that financial compensation is an indication of appreciation and fairness. Meaning, faculty members have been shown to perceive salaries as a form of recognition and appreciation (Barbezat, 2002; Hagedorn, 2000). Thus, academics who perceive outside offers as a recognition of their professional capability and worth are more likely to leave their place of work (O'Meara, 2015).

External environment

The external environment has also been shown to influence a faculty member's intention to leave (Barnes et al., 1998; O'Meara, 2015). It includes such influences as previous cross-cultural experiences, the length of residency within a host culture, organizational culture, and outside offers.

Since in many cases, a faculty member's intention to leave is affected by difficulties adjusting to a new culture, previous experience of the host culture is considered helpful, especially for expatriate academics (Masgoret, 2006; Parker & McEvoy, 1993). Individuals with previous overseas experience can transfer their knowledge to a new culture with greater ease, since they have already acquired the skills to cope with uncertainties through observation, modeling, and reinforcement (Aycan, 1997; Black, 1988). For individuals with no prior overseas experience, the duration of their residency in the host country is positively connected to their ability to adjust to new culture (Miller, 2009); thus, individuals who better adjust are more likely to stay. Organizational cultural factors are linked to social and logistical support, which are seen as essential to improve staff retention (Quansah, 2017). In the face of such challenges, it was suggested that the allocation of appropriate rewards could be motivating and increase foreign faculty commitment to a host institution (Aycan, 1997).

Finally, outside offers impact a faculty member's intention to leave in a few ways. First, as O'Meara's (2015) research has demonstrated, leaving and remaining faculty members perceived outside offers as a normative event needed to move up the career ladder. It was suggested that if an administration were supportive of faculty academic growth and promotion, academics might not have a need to quit. Once again, the decision to move to a new university for career purposes is likely to be linked to dissatisfaction and feelings of unfairness in the current institution. In such circumstances, individuals may feel the need to prove their academic worth by receiving outside offers. Second, based on some institutions' policies, outside offers are required to leverage a salary increase. In this case, faculty members do not pursue a change of workplace per se but aim at bargaining a better offer from their university (O'Meara, 2015).

Research questions

The following research questions were asked to investigate what factors higher education faculty members in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries take into account in their decisions to stay or not to stay in their respective institutions.

- Is there is any relationship between a faculty member's intent to stay and the proportion of time spent in research, teaching, and service?

- Do faculty members' perceptions about their work and working conditions predict their intentions to stay?
- Does faculty intention to stay differ by such background factors as gender, current place of work, experience in higher education teaching in the GCC, and having school-age children?

Methods

Design and data

This quantitative research utilized a non-experimental correlational design. This design is appropriate for two reasons. First, the purpose of this study is to quantitatively investigate relationships among variables based on the participants' opinions and attitudes. According to John W. Creswell and J. David Creswell (2018, p.147) non-experimental quantitative design is an appropriate method to study the "trends, attitudes, and opinions of a population, or test for associations among variables of population." Second, correlational design is appropriate because it provides an opportunity "to predict scores and explain the relationship among variables" (Creswell, 2015, p. 339).

The instrument used for the study was a questionnaire developed by the researchers. The questionnaire was pilot tested with 16 higher education faculty members who have more than five years of teaching experience in the GCC countries, namely Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA), and the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The sample size for the pilot study is within the range of 10–30 participants, as recommended by Stephen Isaac and William Michael (1995) and Robin Hill (1998). Pilot study participants were given the electronic questionnaire along with an explanation of the purpose of the study. They were also encouraged to provide comments. The results of the pilot study improved the content validity; comments and suggestions on the structure and wording of sentences were incorporated. For the purpose of reliability, Chronbach's alpha was conducted on the 15 Likert-type questions on items regarding faculty work and working conditions, which resulted in an excellent internal consistency of $\alpha = .90$.

Data was collected from current higher education faculty in the GCC countries. The link to the electronic survey was sent to 600 GCC faculty through their official email addresses, as found in their institution's website; 139 people responded. This is a good size for this type of study according to Creswell (2015), who recommends "30 participants for a correlational study that relates variables" (p. 145). An overwhelming number of the participants (90%) were expatriates. Of the total study participants, 64 percent were male and 36 percent were female, 43 percent worked for government universities, 43 percent worked for private for-profit universities, and 14 percent worked for nonprofit universities. The professional experiences of the respondents vary. Twenty-seven percent of participants had 21 or more years of experience in higher education, 38 percent had between 11–20 years of experience, 26 percent had between six and 10 years, and nine percent had worked for five years or less in higher education. The highest educational degree completed by participants varied from a doctoral degree (79%) to a master's degree (20%). One participant had a bachelor's degree. The academic ranks of participants were professors (10%), asso-

ciate professors (24%), assistant professor (50%), lecturers (11%), and instructors (6%). The majority (58%) had school-age children, while 42 percent did not have school-age children.

Study variables

The dependent variable for all research questions is "faculty intention to stay." This variable is asked is based on a survey question 18n (see Appendix A), which asks participants to rate if they intend to stay in their current organization on a Likert scale, where 1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, or 6 = agree strongly.

The independent variables vary by question. For the first research question, the independent variable was "time spent on research, teaching, and service," based on survey question number 14 that asked participants to provide the approximate percentage of time they spend in each of those three areas with choices of: 1) less than 25 percent, 2) 25–50 percent, 3) 51–75 percent, and 4) greater than 75 percent. The independent variables for research question two were 15 perception-related statements on faculty work and working conditions that asked participants to rate their agreements on a Likert scale, where 1 = disagree strongly, 2 = disagree, 3 = somewhat disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, 5 = agree, or 6 = agree strongly. For the third research question, multiple questions were used as independent variables, such as item number 1 for gender, item number 2 for current place of work, item number 5 for higher education work experience in the GCC, and item number 9 for the question about children.

Analysis

Three sets of analyses were conducted. A Pearson's correlation was run for the first research question. For the second research question, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was conducted. For the third research question, two types of analysis were performed: a *t*-test for the dichotomous independent variables and an analysis of variance (ANOVA) for the other two categorical independent variables with multiple choices.

Results

The analysis of each research question generated several results. Table 1 shows the result of the correlation analysis on the relationship between a faculty member's intent to stay and the proportion of time they spent in research, teaching, and service.

	Intention to stay in the current university for many years
The percentage of time approximately spent on teaching, preparing for classes, advising, and supervising students at this institution.	.000
The percentage of time approximately spent on research and scholarship activities.	.284**
The percentage of time approximately spent on service or administration activities other than teaching or research.	–.138

Table 1: Relationship between intent to stay and the proportion of time spent in related activities

According to the correlation analysis presented in Table 1, there is no relationship between a faculty member's intention to stay and the amount of time they spent in teaching and teaching-related activities. Similarly, there is no significant relationship between a faculty member's intention to stay and time spent in service and administrative activities. However, though weak (.284), there is a positive relationship between a faculty member's intention to stay and the amount of time they spent in research and scholarship activities. Meaning, the more time institutions allow their faculty to spend in research and scholarship activities, the longer faculty members are likely to stay.

Multiple regression was conducted to determine the accuracy of the 15 independent variables regarding faculty members' perception about their work and working conditions in predicting their intention to stay. Data screening, through stepwise regression, eliminated 12 variables. The model summary and the coefficient tables are presented in Table 2 with the respective analysis.

Model	*R*	R-squared	Adjusted R-squared	Std. error of the estimate	Change statistics				
					R-squared change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
1	.850	.723	.717	.815	.030	13.404	1	125	.000

Table 2: Model summary predicting intention to stay

Notes: Dependent variable: Intention to stay; Predictors: Overall, I am satisfied with my job in my current university. My current university has a good research environment and sufficient library collection, I like the city/region where I currently live.

Regression results indicate that the overall model (Table 2) significantly predicts faculty intention to stay: R^2 =.723, R^2 = .723, F (1, 125) = 108.839, p < .001. This model accounts for 72.3 percent of variance in faculty intention to stay. A summary of regression coefficients, presented in Table 3, indicates that all the three variables (overall faculty job satisfaction, good institutional research environment, and faculty fondness of the city/region) significantly contributed to the model.

	Standardized coefficients			
	Std. error	Beta	t	Sig.
Over all, I am satisfied with my job in my current university	.661	.073	.582	9.107	<.001
My current university has a good research environment and a sufficient library collection	.243	.063	.242	3.876	<.001
I like the city/region where I currently live	.207	.056	.186	3.661	<.001

Table 3: Coefficients for model variables

Note: Dependent Variable: I intend/plan to stay in my current university for many years.

Because overall job satisfaction contributed the most to the model (β = .582), as shown in Table 3, an additional regression analysis was run to see which faculty perception variables impact job satisfaction. After a stepwise regression was conducted on 14 independent variables regarding faculty members' perceptions of their work and working conditions, nine variables were screened and eliminated. Tables 4 and 5 below present the model summary and the coefficients of the model variables, respectively.

Regression results (Table 4) indicate that the overall model significantly predicts overall faculty satisfaction: R^2 =.710, R^2 = .710, F (1, 123) = 60.255, p < .005. This model accounts for 71 percent of variance in overall faculty job satisfaction. A summary of regression coefficients, presented in Table 5, indicates that all the five variables (support for faculty creativity and innovation, sense of community and collegiality, compensation and salary, conducive research environment, and fair faculty treatment) significantly contributed to the model.

Model	*R*	R-squared	Adjusted R-squared	Std. error of the estimate	Change statistics				
					R-squared change	*F* change	*df*1	*df*2	Sig. *F* change
1	.843	.710	.698	.740	.014	5.810	1	123	.017

Table 4: Model summary predicting faculty overall satisfaction

Notes: Dependent variable: Overall faculty satisfaction; Predictors: My current university supports creativity and innovative ideas from faculty. There is a sense of community and collegiality among faculty in my current university. My current university pays comparable salary and compensation to other universities in this country. My current university has a good research environment and sufficient library collection. All faculty are treated fairly in my current university.

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients		
	B	Std. error	Beta	*t*	Sig.
My current university supports creativity and innovative ideas from faculty.	.268	.057	.307	4.746	.000
There is a sense of community and collegiality among faculty in my current university.	.256	.066	.243	3.871	.000
My current university pays comparable salary and compensation to other universities in this country.	.233	.051	.239	4.560	.000
My current university has a good research environment and sufficient library collection.	.172	.058	.195	2.986	.003
All faculty are treated fairly in my current university.	.133	.055	.154	2.410	.017

Table 5: Coefficients for model variables

Note: Dependent variable: Overall, I am satisfied with my job in my current university.

Various statistical analyses were conducted to see if faculty intention to stay differs by gender, current place of work, experience teaching in higher education in the GCC, and having school-age children.

According to the independent sample *t*-test of comparison by gender, the male faculty mean rating (3.96) was only slightly higher than the female faculty (3.56) regarding their intent to stay, and the difference was not large enough to be statistically significant (t = 1.462, p = .146).

Another independent *t*-test was run to compare the mean differences regarding intention to stay between faculty who have young children and those who do not. There were negligible mean differences (3.88 and 3.66 respectively) with no statistically significant difference (t = .748, p = .455).

An ANOVA was used to compare intent to stay by institution type. The result shows that there was a significant difference in intention to stay between faculty teaching in government, nonprofit, and for-profit universities at the $p < .5$ level: [F (2,136) = 3.49. p = .033]. The post-hoc comparison indicated that the mean score regarding faculty's intent to stay in private for-profit institutions (M = 3.85, SD = 1.5) was significantly lower (p = .032) than faculty in nonprofit institutions (M = 4.37, SD = 1.2). However, faculty working in government universities (M = 4.0, SD = 1.5) did not significantly differ in their intent to stay from those from private and not-for-profit university.

Another ANOVA was run to determine if prior experience teaching in the GCC area makes a difference in faculty's intent to stay. The result shows that there is no significant difference (p = . 561) among those who had low, medium, and high levels of experiences.

Discussion

The purpose of this study is to investigate the factors behind GCC higher education faculty members' intent to stay or leave their current institutions. The results of the study show that GCC faculty intention to stay is affected by factors both external and internal to the institution. Previous researchers, such as Anne-Marie Masgoret (2006) and Barbara Parker and Glenn McEvoy (1993), have stated the impact of external conditions as a determining factor for faculty's intention to leave, arguing that difficulty adjusting to a new culture is a possible reason for departure. This is consistent with the findings of David Quansah (2017), who listed social and logistical support as essential factors for faculty adjustment and to ultimately improve retention. Similarly, previous studies underlined the importance of internal institutional factors such as communication, openness, fair rewards, autonomy, and voice in organizational decision-making (Austin, 2002; Lawrence et al., 2014; Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) for faculty making departure-related decisions. This study specifically found that the intention of GCC faculty to stay or leave their current institution is affected by such factors as overall job satisfaction, good institutional research environment, and fondness of the city/region where they work.

Overall job satisfaction is the most significant factor for GCC faculty's decision to stay or to leave their institution. This is consistent with past research (Black & Stephens, 1989; Hofstede, 2001; Miller, 2009). Further analysis shows that faculty's overall job satisfaction is, in turn, affected by institutional support for faculty creativity and innovation, a sense of community and collegiality within the institution, competitiveness of compensation and salary, a conducive research environment, and the fair treatment of all faculty. While most of these are internal factors, compensation and salary, which are categorized as a separate variable in the conceptual framework, are included. It is, therefore, possible to state that compensation and salary indirectly contribute to faculty departure decision through overall job satisfaction.

Promotion in rank, securing tenure (when applicable), and employability are to a great extent tied to faculty scholarly productivity. Hence, it is not surprising for faculty to indicate "research environment" as a significant factor that determines their intent to stay. This finding is consistent with Esther Kingston-Mann and Tim Sieber

(2001) and O'Meara (2015), who found that a conducive research environment is a crucial factor in a faculty member's decision to stay.

This study also found that fondness of the city/region is one of the factors GCC faculty take into account when making mobility decisions. This is in line with previous research that suggests that once individuals are accustomed to a culture and develop ties to a region, they may feel comfortable working there (Austin, Chapman, Farah, Wilson, & Ridge, 2014; Kreber & Hounsell, 2014).

This study's findings regarding the importance of institution type in mobility decisions are mixed. While GCC faculty working for private for-profit universities are less likely to stay than those working for nonprofit private universities, faculty working in government universities did not significantly differ in their intent to stay, either from those from private, for-profit universities or not-for-profit universities. We also found no statistically significant difference, in their intent to stay, between those faculty members who have long teaching experiences in the GCC area and those who do not.

There were two surprising findings. First, because the Middle East is predominantly a patriarchal society, it could be assumed that male and female faculty would have different reasons for mobility decisions. This study found no difference. It could also be assumed that faculty who have school-age children would have different intentions to stay than those without school-age children. This assumption was based on the observation that K–12 education expenses are extremely high in the region, and hence those faculty with school-age children would factor the variations in the amount of children's educational allowances, which are commonly offered as part of their compensation package This study did not, however, find any difference between faculty with and without school-age children.

Implications

Faculty leave their institutions for various reasons. However, higher education institutions should pay utmost attention to contributing factors for departures, since they could be a symptom of underlying institutional problems. This study identified job satisfaction as a reason for GCC faculty departure. Institutions should be alarmed when faculty leave due to job satisfaction issues, as the ramifications go beyond faculty departure. When job satisfaction is low, faculty are less likely to give their best to the students, which will have adverse effects on the students' overall educational experience. As Robert Khan, Donald Wolfe, Robert Quinn, Dedrick Snoek, and Robert Rosenthal (1964) stated, a decreased level of job satisfaction affects workplace productivity.

Institutions should also create a supportive research environment for faculty through improved institutional policy and resource allocation. Instituting better policy regarding faculty course load that takes into account increased faculty research hours is one suggestion. Increased investment on research-related resources, such as a relevant library collection and sufficient laboratory capacity, could minimize the departure of faculty who might be attracted to well-funded and better-equipped universities elsewhere. Institutions may offer various services to improve faculty's fondness of a region through providing acculturation services and need-based logistical support, as suggested by Quansah (2017).

In sum, to minimize faculty departure, GCC institutions should address the ma-

terial, fiscal, and social needs of their faculty. Specifically, boosting the resource and the environment for research, innovation, and creativity; compensating faculty comparably with peer institutions; improving the institutional environment for collegiality; and treating all faculty fairly are crucial. Regular faculty opinion surveys may also help in identifying and addressing job satisfaction issues.

The issue of faculty turnover in the GCC region has not been studied extensively. This study adds to the conversation and serves as a resource for future research. Further research with more selected variables, unique to the Middle East, and using a qualitative research approach may help to unearth more region-specific findings.

Limitations

This study is not without limitation. First, this is a cross-sectional study. Cross-sectional studies, unlike longitudinal studies, show a snapshot rather than a trend overtime; hence, the study may produce a different result if conducted in another time. Second, a number of potential participants' emails bounced, limiting the number of responses. This is probably due to lack of regular updating of websites by the institutions.

References

Ambrose, S., Huston, T., & Norman, M. (2005). A qualitative method for assessing faculty satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, *46*(7), 803–830.

Austin, A.E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(1), 94–122.

Austin, A.E., Chapman, D.W., Farah, S., Wilson, E., & Ridge, N. (2014). Expatriate academic staff in the United Arab Emirates: The nature of their work experiences in higher education institutions. *Higher Education*, *68*(4), 541–557.

Aycan, Z. (1997). Expatriate adjustment as a multifaceted phenomenon: Individual and organizational level predictors. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *8*(4), 434–456.

Barbezat, D. (2002). History of Pay Equity Studies. In R. Toutkoushian (ed.*), Conducting Salary-Equity Studies: Alternative Approaches to Research, New Directions for Institutional Research Series, Number 115* (pp. 9–40). San Francisco CA: Jossey-Bass.

Barnes, L.L., Agago, M.O., & Coombs, W.T. (1998). Effects of job-related stress on faculty intention to leave academia. *Research in Higher Education*, *39*(4), 457–469.

Benzoni, K.A., Rousseau, D.M., & Li, M. (2006). Managing relationships across generations of academics: Psychological contracts in faculty-doctoral student collaborations. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *17*(1), 4–33.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *57*(3), 195–203.

Black, J.S. (1988). Work role transitions: A study of American expatriate managers in Japan. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *19* (2), 533–546.

Black, J., & Stephens, G. (1989). The influence of the spouse on American expatriate adjustment and intent to stay in Pacific Rim overseas assignments. *Journal of Management, 15*(4), 529–544.

Blackburn, R.T., & Havighurst, R.J. (1979). Career patterns of US male academic social scientists. *Higher Education*, *8*(5), 553–572.

Brown, D.G. (1967). *The mobile professors*. Washington, DC: American Council of Education.

Chapman, D.W., & Austin, A.E. (Eds.). (2002). *Higher education in the developing world: Changing contexts and institutional responses.* Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Publishing Group. Clark, B.R. (1989). The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. *Educational Researcher*, *18*(5), 4–8.

Clarke, M. (2007). Language policy and language teacher education in the United Arab Emirates. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(3), 583–591.

Cotton, J.L., & Tuttle, J.M. (1986). Employee turnover: A meta-analysis and review with implications for research. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*(1), 55–70.

Creswell, J. (2015). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative Research*. New York, NY: Pearson.

Creswell, J.W., & Creswell, J.D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Daly, C.J., & Dee, J.R. (2006). Greener pastures: Faculty turnover intent in urban public universities. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(5), 776–803.

Darrah, M., Hougland, J., & Prince, B. (2014). Salary, space, and satisfaction: An examination of gender differences in the sciences. *Research in Higher Education Journal*, *23*, 1–34.

Ehrenberg, R.G., Kasper, H., & Rees, D.I. (1990). *Faculty turnover at American colleges and universities: Analysis of AAUP data* (No. w3239). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Flowers, V.S., & Hughes, C.L. (1973). Why employees stay. *Harvard Business Review*, *51*(4), 49–60.

Gardner, S.K. (2012). "I couldn't wait to leave the toxic environment": A mixed methods study of women faculty satisfaction and departure from one research institution. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education*, *5*(1), 71–95.

Hagedorn, L.S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2000*(105), 5–20.

Harvey, M.C. (1985). The executive family: An overlooked variable in international assignments. *Columbia Journal of World Business*, *20*(1), 84–92.

Hill, R. (1998). What sample size is "enough" in internet survey research? Interpersonal computing and technology. *An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century*, *6*(3-4), 1–12.

Hofstede, G. (1986). The usefulness of the "organizational culture" concept. *Journal of Management Studies*, *23*(3), 253–257.

Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Holland, J.L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of career* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W.B. (1995). *Handbook in research and evaluation*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Services.

Johnsrud, L.K., & Heck, R.H. (1994). A university's faculty: Identifying who will leave and who will stay. *Journal for Higher Education Management*, *10*(1), 71–84.

Johnsrud, L.K., & Rosser, V.J. (2002). Faculty members' morale and their intention to leave: A multilevel explanation. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *73*(4), 518–542.

Kahn, R., Wolfe, D., Quinn, R., Snoek, J., and Rosenthal, R. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity.* New York: Wiley

Kingston-Mann, E., & Sieber, R.T. (Eds.). (2001). *Achieving against the odds: How academics become teachers of diverse students*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Kreber, C., & Hounsell, J. (2014). Being an international academic: A phenomenological study of academic migrants adjusting to working and living in Scotland. *Academic Mobility: International Perspectives on Higher Education Research, Volume 11,* 9–33. West Yorkshire, UK: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

Lawrence, J.H., Celis, S., & Ott, M. (2014). Is the tenure process fair? What faculty think. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *85*(2), 155–192.

Lindholm, J. (2003). Perceived organizational fit: Nurturing the minds, hearts, and personal ambitions of university faculty. *Review of Higher Education*, *27*(1), 125–149.

Masgoret, A.M. (2006). Examining the role of language attitudes and motivation on the sociocultural adjustment and the job performance of sojourners in Spain. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*(3), 311–331.

Matier, M.W. (1990). Retaining faculty: A tale of two campuses. *Research in Higher Education*, *31*(1), 39–60.

McGee, G.W., & Ford, R.C. (1987). Faculty research productivity and intention to change positions. *The Review of Higher Education*, *11*(1), 1–16.

Miller, P.W. (2009). Reconstructing teacher identities: Shock, turbulence, resistance and adaptation in Caribbean teacher migration to England. *Education, Knowledge & Economy*, *3*(2), 97–105.

Mobley, W.H. (1982). *Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control*. Boston, MA: Addison-Wesley.

O'Meara, K. (2015). Half-way out: How requiring outside offers to raise salaries influences faculty retention and organizational commitment. *Research in Higher Education*, *56*(3), 279–298.

O'Meara, K., Bennett, J.C., & Neihaus, E. (2016). Left unsaid: The role of work expectations and psychological contracts in faculty careers and departure. *The Review of Higher Education*, *39*(2), 269–297.

Olsen, D., Maple, S.A., & Stage, F.K. (1995). Women and minority faculty job satisfaction: Professional role interests, professional satisfaction, and institutional fit. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *66*(3), 267–293.

Parker, B., & McEvoy, G.M. (1993). Initial examination of a model of intercultural adjustment. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *17*(3), 355–379.

Price, J.L. (1997). Handbook of organizational measurement. *International journal of manpower*, *18*(4/5/6), 305–558.

Quansah, D.K. (2017). *Cross-cultural adjustment of expatriate academics in selected higher education institutions in the United Arab Emirates.* [Doctoral dissertation]. Dubai, UAE: The British University in Dubai.

Richardson, J., & McKenna, S. (2002). Leaving and experiencing: Why academics expatriate and how they experience expatriation. *Career Development International*, *7*(2), 67–78.

Robinson, S.L., & Rousseau, D.M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *15*(3), 245–259.

Rosser, V.J. (2004). Faculty members' intentions to leave: A national study on their worklife and satisfaction. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(3), 285–309.

Rosser, V.J., & Townsend, B.K. (2006). Determining public 2-year college faculty's intent to leave: An empirical model. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *77*(1), 124–147.

Smart, J.C. (1990). A causal model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, *31*(5), 405–424.

Tierney, W.G., & Bensimon, E.M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Trower, C.A. (2012). *Success on the tenure track: Five keys to faculty job satisfaction*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Xu, Y.J. (2008). Faculty turnover: Discipline-specific attention is warranted. *Research in Higher Education*, *49*(1), 40–61.

Yan, G., Yue, Y., & Niu, M. (2015). An empirical study of faculty mobility in China. *Higher Education*, *69*(4), 527–546.

Zhou, Y., & Volkwein, J.F. (2004). Examining the influences on faculty departure intentions: A comparison of tenured versus non-tenured faculty at research universities using NSOPF-99. *Research in Higher Education*, *45*(2), 139–176.

Appendix A

Higher Education Faculty Intention to Stay Survey Instrument

Thank you for being a part of this "Higher Education Faculty Intention to Stay" study. Your response is very important to help understand factors that matter for faculty members decisions to stay or leave their organizations. This survey has two major parts. Part I is a brief background about yourself. Part II contains questions that ask participants about their current work. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes. By filling this survey you are consenting to participate in the study. This study is anonymous, meaning your identity is not known to the researcher and data is reported in aggregate (collective/ in total numbers). Again, your participation is much appreciated.

Part I: Background of Participants

Instruction: Choose what better/best describes you from the given alternatives.

1. Your Gender
    a) Male
    b) Female
2. You currently work for
    a) Private for-profit university
    b) Private not-for-profit university
    c) Government university
3. Your total professional work experience
    a) 1–5 years
    b) 6–10 years
    c) 11–20 years
    d) 21 years and over
4. Your total higher education work experience.
    a) 1–5 years
    b) 6–10 years
    c) 11–20
    d) 20 years and over
5. Your total higher education work experience in the GCC
    a) 1–5 years
    b) 6–10 years
    c) 11 years and over
6. How many years have you been working at your current university?
    a) 3 or less
    b) 4–10
    c) 11 or more

7. What is the highest degree you have completed? Do not include honorary degrees.
    a) Bachelor's
    b) Masters
    c) Doctoral/
    d) Other Terminal degree
8. What is your academic rank?
    a) Professor
    b) Associate professor
    c) Assistant professor
    d) Instructor
    e) Lecturer
9. Which of the following describes you?
    a) I have school-aged or younger child/children
    b) I don't have school-aged or younger child/children
10. Indicate your country/nationality?
    a) UAE
    b) Other GCC
    c) Other Middle East
    d) North Africa
    e) Other Africa
    f) India/Pakistan/Bangladesh
    g) Other Asian
    h) USA/Canada /UK/Australia/New Zealand
    i) Other Western Europe
    j) Eastern Europe, including the Balkans
    k) South American and Caribbean
11. Which country are you working in now (currently)?
    a) Bahrain
    b) Kuwait
    c) Oman
    d) Qatar
    e) Saudi Arabia
    f) UAE

Part II: Current Work-Related Questions

INSTRUCTION: CHOOSE WHAT BEST DESCRIBES YOUR PRACTICE/EXPERIENCE.

12. What is your teaching load in your current university?
    a) 2 or less courses a semester
    b) 3 courses a semester
    c) 4 courses a semester
    d) 5 courses a semester
    e) 6 or more courses a semester

13. Which level do you primarily teach in your current university?
    a) Undergraduate/bachelor
    b) Graduate/post graduate
14. What is the percentage of your time approximately spent on the following tasks

Activity	<25%	25-50%	51-75%	>75%
Teaching and preparing for classes, advising, and supervising students at this university				
Research and scholarship activities				
Service or administration activities other than teaching or research				

15. Indicate the number of your scholarly work(s) **before** joining your current university

Scholarly activities	None	one	two	three	four or more
How many articles/creative work(s) did you publish in peer reviewed/refereed journal(s)					
How many times did you present your work in relevant professional conferences/ exhibitions					
How many book chapters did you author					
How many textbooks or other reference book did you author					
How many accepted patents/creative works did you produce					

16. Indicate your scholarly contribution(s) that you started and finished **after** joining your current university

Scholarly activities	None	one	two	three	four or more
How many articles/creative works did you publish in peer reviewed/refereed journal(s)					
How many times did you present your work in relevant professional conferences/ exhibitions					
How many book chapters did you author					
How many textbooks or other reference books did you author					
How many accepted patents/creative works did you produce					

17. How many times were you promoted in rank (such as from assistant professor to associate professor; associate professor to professor) after you joined your current university?
    a) 0 – Zero
    b) 1 – Once
    c) >2 – Twice or more

18. Rate the following based on your level of agreement about your current organization from 1 to 6 where "1 = Strongly disagree," "2 = Disagree," "3 = Somewhat Disagree," "4 = Somewhat Agree," "5 = Agree," and "6 = Strongly Agree."

Item	1	2	3	4	5	6
All faculty are treated fairly in my current university						
My current salary and compensation package are reasonable compared to others in the same rank in this university						
My current university pays comparable salary and compensation to other universities in this country						
Children education allowance of my current university is attractive						
My current university supports creativity and innovative ideas from faculty						
The instructional/course materials in my current university are up-to-date and relevant						
The computer Technology (software and hardware) in my current university are relevant and up to date.						
My current university has a good research environment and sufficient library collection						
The current leadership of my immediate unit (department and college) is competent and supportive						
The leadership at the university level is competent and supportive in my current university.						
Faculty participate in relevant decision-making process about university policy in my current university						
Faculty in my current university have reasonable authority/flexibility to make instructional (course content selection and delivery) decisions.						
Over all, I am satisfied with my job in my current university						
I intend/plan to stay in my current university for many years						
There is a sense of community and collegiality among faculty in this university						
I like the city/region where I currently live						

Thank you for your time!